

June 27, 2012

File No: Zac-11-020

Co-ordinator

Planning Committee

City of Hamilton

71 Main St W, 1st Floor, Hamilton, ON, L8P 4Y5

Dear Co-ordinator:

As the owners of 3 Longview Drive, we wish to oppose the Zoning By-law Amendment for 3250 Homestead Drive (File No: ZAC-11-020). Our position has not changed at all from our previous letter that we sent to Alvin Chan's office on April 27, 2011.

We do realize that the proposed plan has changed a bit in regards to the exterior set up. We are resubmitting our opposition letter in case those minor changes make the letter from April 27, 2011 obsolete.

I would also like to make amendments to my previous letter.

I realize that the lot is a corner lot; therefore, one of the sides does run along Longview Drive. What I am puzzled about is the proposed layout of the structure. Longview Drive is a residential street and is to remain that way even in the new Urban Official Plan when it is fully adopted. It is Homestead Drive that has been proposed to be developed as commercial. If we are to be developing Homestead, then I am puzzled as to why we would allow a building to be erected that seems to be developing Longview and not Homestead? The storefronts or proposed commercial spaces run along Longview. This proposed setup would typically indicate that the development is along Longview, a residential street. If we develop Homestead Drive then shouldn't the commercial space run parallel to that road?

It is my understanding that when new buildings are erected into an area that is against a residential space that the new building should not impede on the residential space. The sheer size of a three story building beside a single story dwelling will impede greatly. I wonder: is it not common practise to use step down features in the buildings size to minimize some of the imposition? I do not want my house to look like a shed because of being shadowed by this monstrosity. Simple math indicates that three is a lot bigger than one.

In response to the new parking lot arrangement, I do realize that the copy we received of the newly proposed layout has supposedly met the required spaces. The typical dwelling out here does have two cars. The addition of parking spaces has not put me at ease. I still fear that my street will become a parking lot. Is it not easier to park on street right in front of the storefront? If you answered yes then you would be parking on Longview Drive, my quiet residential street. Parking on Longview supports my argument that mentions the building running parallel to Longview Drive and not Homestead Drive.

I also wonder where they propose that the garbage bins will now be located. I do not see it on the proposal drawing. I do not want to be in my backyard trying to enjoy time with my children and smell their garbage.

Overall, I hope that the city understands that this proposal does not meet the residents of Mount Hope's desires.

The following, with the exception of the address portion, is the letter that was submitted by Crystal Schweyer and Cameron Brown on April 27, 2011:

When we purchased our home, we felt that this would provide the perfect setting to raise a family. We also felt that this area was a great investment opportunity. We feel that this proposed building, in the bid to raise their property value, will deflate our property value. A possible decrease in our property value is disheartening to say the least. There is no need for another commercial building to be erected when this community has a tough time supporting businesses that are already here. There is an abundance of commercially zoned land in the area that is currently unoccupied. The intrusion of this proposed amendment to allow for a three storey mixed use building on our quiet street makes us question what our future holds.

The sheer size of the building will destroy the character and charm of the neighbourhood. Many of the residents have moved to this area to enjoy the tranquil setting it provides. The tranquil setting will be lost to this development. We feel that this development is not compatible for this corner lot. The occupied commercial properties (more specifically 3234 Homestead Drive and 3243 Homestead Drive) take great pride in working within the community to keep up with our character. The commercial properties keep business hours that do not impede on our humble lifestyle and the upkeep of their holdings is impeccable.

The zoning designated to the land on 3250 Homestead Drive by the former Township of Glanbrook was adopted by the City of Hamilton under the new Urban Hamilton Official Plan. The Urban Hamilton Official Plan has been under scrutiny by an appeal with the Ontario Municipal Board. New policies for Commercial and Mixed use designations are included. We wonder if proposed Commercial and Mixed Use Zones are still on hold until the whole Official Plan is approved. If that is the case, why would council even be considering this application? In the surrounding areas, there is an abundance of commercial land that is not used to its full potential. Our first goal should be to help those lands achieve success before we add to the pile of vacant lots.

The lands that are primarily located around 3250 Homestead Drive are single family dwellings. We have three small children. We are fearful of the detrimental effects that an increase in traffic flow to the proposed site may cause. There are limited easy and safe access points for pedestrians. Limited access points are predominant on Longview Drive. There is only one clearly marked crosswalk in the general area. In fact, there is not a sidewalk lining the residential side of Longview Drive. The residents must cross the road to access the sidewalk. The proposed building plan has a drive located on Longview Drive; therefore, the increased traffic flow will be putting my family at risk.

The lack of proper parking spaces will also cause traffic flow problems. The proposed plans do not provide the correct amount of spaces set out by the City of Hamilton's By-laws. Why have by-laws if our own City Council does not abide by them? Where does the owner of the building suggest that the occupants of the building and the visitors park? Lack of provided parking spaces means that we will find the vehicular overflow parked on our streets. Cars parked in the street cause traffic congestion. Traffic congestion hinders fire routes. The safety of my family and other residents are placed in danger again.

Sewer and water may also be a problem. We question whether the proposed site has the ability to sustain proper sewer and adequate water supply. Will the building hinder our water and sewer services? If there are changes or upgrades needed, who will be responsible for those costs? If the city is responsible for a portion of the costs, can the taxpayers truly afford it?

In regards to water, we are also concerned about the grading of the property. Our property contains a catch basin in the back yard. We do not want to see our property flooded every time it rains. The city has enough issues with flooding.

The concerns previously stated are only a few that we have in regards to the application to amend the Zoning By-law. Overall, we wish to clearly state, once again, that we strongly disagree to an approval of the proposed zoning amendment.

Sincerely,

Crystal and [Signature]  
Schweyer

